

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended and claims 6 and 7 are newly added.

Claims 1 through 5 stand finally rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czeiler et al. (US patent 4,421,803) (hereinafter 'Czeiler') in view of Jansen et al. (US patent 5,766,336) (hereinafter 'Jansen').

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a coating 'consisting essentially of' an inorganic colored pigment, instead of 'comprising' such a pigment. This new terminology restricts the coating to the pigment and minor amounts of other materials such as unintentional impurities. Thus, with this terminology, it is clear that Applicant's coating does not include other major components or constituents, such as the glass matrix disclosed by Czeiler.

Since Czeiler clearly teaches that for proper adhesion of the coating to the surface of the glass envelope, the pigment particles must be firmly embedded in a glass matrix (col. 2, lines 22-24), then even if the pigments of Jansen are substituted for those of Czeiler, the substitution would result in a coating of pigment particles embedded in a glass matrix, not in a coating consisting essentially of pigment particles, as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, it is urged that claims 1-5 are patentable over the combination of Czeiler in view of Jansen, and it is urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition to the amendment of claim 1, new dependent claims 6 and 7, and new independent claim 8 have been added.

Claim 6 calls for the incandescent lamp of claim 2 to be evacuated. Support for this claim may be found on page 2, in
C:\PROFESSIONAL\PhilipsAMDS2003\PHDE000085rceamd.doc

the paragraph beginning at line 26, wherein it is stated that such evacuation is made possible by the chemical inertness of the coating, and results in improved safety in handling over lamps with an inert gas filling.

Czeiler does not teach or suggest that his colored lamps may be evacuated rather than filled with an inert gas. Jansen does not teach anything with regard to lamps.

Claim 7 calls for the white pigment to be selected from the group of kaolin, feldspar, silicon dioxide and titanium dioxide. Support for this claim may be found on page 4, in the paragraph beginning at line 7.

Although Czeiler teaches the use of titanium dioxide as a pigment (col. 2, line 36), he does not teach or suggest the particular group of white pigments claimed by Applicant. Jansen is silent as to any pigments other than the particular colored oxide nitride pigments disclosed.

Claim 8 combines the limitations of original independent claim 1 with the limitation of dependent claim 4 to a white pigment. As explained in the first line of page 3, the white pigment may be added to the colored pigment to soften the color thereof.

Although Czeiler teaches the use of titanium dioxide as a pigment, neither Czeiler nor Jansen teach or suggest the use of a white pigment **in combination with** a colored pigment, for the purpose of softening or for any other purpose.

Accordingly, it is felt the claims 6-8 are patentable over the combination of Czeiler in view of Jansen.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests

that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of record, allow all of the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584